



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Shunpei Yamazaki, et al. Art Unit : 2823
Serial No. : 08/994,038 Examiner : W. David Coleman
Filed : December 18, 1997
Title : CHARGE TRANSFER SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE AND
MANUFACTURING METHOD THEREOF

MAIL STOP AF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO ACTION OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2004

In reply to the Final Office Action of September 30, 2004 (which was supplemental to the Final Office Action of June 22, 2004), Applicant submits the following remarks.

Regarding preliminary matters, Applicant notes that an IDS was filed September 29, 2004. However, an initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 that was filed with the IDS was not included with the present Office Action. Realizing that the IDS may not have been received prior to the issuance of the September 30 Office Action, Applicant requests that the Examiner return an initialed copy of the listed references with the Examiner's next official communication.

Claims 2, 6, 11, 12, 14, and 16-26 are pending, with claims 2, 16, 19, 24, 25, and 26 being independent. Claims 1, 3-5, and 13 were previously canceled, and claims 7-10 and 15 are withdrawn. Claims 2, 6, 11, 12, 14 and 16-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,873,003 to Inoue et al. (Inoue) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,582,640 to Okada et al. (Okada).

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn, since neither Inoue nor Okada, nor any proper combination of the two, discloses or properly suggests all of the elements recited in at least independent claims 2, 16, 19, 24, 25, and 26, and, accordingly, the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Specifically, in the Response of April 6, 2004, Applicant set forth at least the following arguments in support of the above contention that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established: